Why: Protects CLEC customers from waiting a long time for a response by an ILEC operator.

Network Performance

TCG has experienced numerous and continuous problems with ILECs that fail to provision adequate facilities to accommodate all traffic from the ILEC's customers to TCG's customers. The result is incomplete calls which the CLEC's customers know nothing about. Many of these failures result from inadequate trunking or switching capacity between the ILEC's end office and its tandem, although some are caused by inadequate interconnection trunks or switching from the ILEC to the CLEC. An ILEC can represent the blocked-call problem to its customers as one caused by the fact that the call is going "off" the ILEC's network. The competitive incentive to provide inadequate interconnection facilities can be mitigated by performance measures for call blockage. Such measures are at the top of the list of "must haves" for CLECs.[9]

Item 28: Ratio of Calls Blocked to Calls Attempted

What: Compares the percent of calls originated by ILEC customers that do not complete to CLEC customers, to the percent of intra-ILEC calls that fail to complete.

Why: Blocked calls point directly to a lack of adequate planning or performance on the ILEC's part -- suggesting a high probability of willful misconduct. The ILEC must provide adequate trunk and switch capacity and reliability within its network and between its network and the CLEC network to route calls to CLEC customers with no greater call blockage than the ILEC itself experiences.

[9] In denying Ameritech's application to enter the long distance market in Michigan, the FCC noted in particular that detailed information about trunk blocking is needed to evaluate whether an ILEC is meeting its performance parity obligations. Application of Ameritech Michigan to Provide In Region InterLATA Services in Michigan, CC Docket No. 97-137, FCC 97-298 (August 19, 1996)("Ameritech Order") at paragraphs 232-235 and footnote 605.

CLECs forecast traffic volumes and add additional trunk groups and switching capacity to handle outbound calls including calls to ILEC customers. The ILEC must also accurately forecast traffic volumes from its customers to the CLEC, and provide adequate peak-hour capacity. Whether one-way or two-way trunking is used, capacity must be sufficient to provide performance parity. ILECs must not be allowed to thwart CLECs' ability to serve their customers by refusing to install sufficient trunks or switch capacity in a timely manner, or by failing to maintain CLEC-specific facilities (such as interconnection trunks) at the same level as the intra-ILEC network.

Code Opening

Management of the customer's telephone number is critical to CLEC customers regardless of whether the CLEC is serving customers entirely on its own network or by use of unbundled ILEC loops. The suggested performance parity measures are based on the tasks that the ILEC must perform when it uses new NXX codes for its own customers or corrects NXX-related problems for its own customers. These concerns will remain even after the North American Numbering Plan Administrator takes over the responsibility for assigning telephone numbers.

Item 29: NXX Loaded and Tested Prior to LERG Effective Date

What: Measures the proportion of ILEC and CLEC NXX codes that are loaded in essential databases and tested for functionality prior to the Local Exchange Routing Guide (LERG) effective date.

Why: A CLEC customer can't receive a call from an ILEC customer (a majority of the potential callers) until the ILEC has updated its databases and switches to reflect the proper routing information to new NXX codes used by the CLEC. The CLEC cannot provide full local exchange service to its customers until the ILEC has made the proper updates. Therefore, it is

important that the ILEC make these updates in the same manner that it would for its own customers. For the purpose of this measure, TCG suggests the LERG effective date since this is the first date that either a CLEC or an ILEC would be able to serve a customer with a new code.

Item 30: MTTR For NXX Troubles

What: Measures the average time it takes the ILEC to resolve troubles that prevent ILEC customers from reaching CLEC customers having a particular NXX.

Why: It has unfortunately been TCG's experience that ILECs, from time to time, drop NXXs from their switches and/or databases after the NXXs have been correctly entered. This is a serious issue because customers with numbers that belong to a dropped NXX are unable to receive calls until the problem is resolved.

In the past, TCG has asked for explanations from the ILECs when NXXs are dropped. While answers are usually unavailable, human error and willful misconduct are the logical explanations. Since ILECs have the competitive incentive to restore their own codes as quickly as possible, ILECs should correct troubles for CLEC NXX codes in time frames that are "at least equal" to the time frames in which the ILECs correct ILEC NXX problems.

Emergency Services (911)

CLECs have certain obligations to the state to provide adequate emergency services to their customers. To meet these, CLECs supply location and numbers of all customers for entry into the "911" databases which the ILECs typically control. (States historically gave ILECs ownership of the "911" databases and only the ILECs can ensure that data supplied by the CLECs is entered promptly and correctly.) A delay in timely database updates will delay CLECs from providing consumers with competitive local exchange service because CLECs are not allowed to -- and TCG as a matter of policy will not -- offer basic local exchange

telecommunications service without 911 capability. Improper entry can also endanger lives.[10]

Item 31: Selective Router Update within 24 hours

What: The selective router is a database that sends an emergency call to the correct dispatch center based on the telephone number of the calling party. This item compares the proportion of CLEC customer numbers that are entered by the ILEC into the selective router database within 24 hours of receipt to the proportion of ILEC customer numbers entered within the same time frame.

Why: CLECs will rely on the ILEC to enter information required to determine the dispatch center associated with each of the CLECs' customers. Reporting on "Selective Router Update within 24 hours" will encourage the ILEC to input information regarding CLEC customers into the Selective Router database in a timely manner.

Item 32: ALI Database Update within 24 Hours

What: The ILEC typically has responsibility for managing the Automatic Location Identifier (ALI) database which correlates each telephone number with an address so that emergency services can be dispatched to the correct location. This item measures the proportion of customer numbers that are entered by the ILEC into the ALI database within 24 hours.

Why: Reporting on "ALI Database Update within 24 hours" encourages the ILEC to input the information for CLEC customers into the ALI database in a timely manner.

[10] The Michigan Commission has stressed that "the public must not wait until [parity of database entry] . . . results in serious harm before [the RBOC] can be required to fix the problem." In re Complaint of the City of Southfield against Ameritech Michigan, Opinion and Order, Michigan Public Service Commission, Case No. U-11229, Sept. 30, 1997 at 12.

Item 33: ALI Database Update Accuracy

What: Measures the proportion of accurate ILEC inputs into the ALI database for ILEC and CLEC customers.

Why: The ILEC must enter the exact data received from the CLEC. If manual entries are made, the ILEC must ensure that no mistakes are made during the process of copying or keying in data.

Item 34: Selective Router Update Accuracy

What: Measures the proportion of accurate entries into the selective router database for ILEC and CLEC customers.

Why: The ILEC must enter the exact data received from the CLEC. If manual entries are made, the ILEC must ensure that no mistakes are made during the process of copying or keying in data.

Item 35: MSAG System Access Response Time

What: The Master Street Access Guide (MSAG) is a list of addresses served by a particular emergency services agency. This item measures how long it takes the ILEC to provide the MSAG to a CLEC upon request.

Why: Carriers require access to the MSAG in order to obtain the proper address citation form so that it can be correctly entered into the ALI database. Therefore, if the ILEC does not timely furnish the MSAG to the CLEC, the CLEC will be delayed in entering properly formatted data in the ALI database.

Directory Listings

Item 36: Directory Listings Database Update Completion Interval

What: Measures the average time interval the ILEC takes to update its directory listing database for a new ILEC or CLEC customer, or when some

information regarding such a customer (address or phone number or name) has changed.

Why: Mandatory ILEC reporting of comparative data will encourage the ILEC to enter the numbers of CLEC customers into the database in a reasonable time frame.

Item 37: Directory Listings Database Update Interval

What: Measures the percent of the time that the ILEC completes updates of information regarding ILEC and CLEC customers into the directory listings database within the same time interval. Most ILECs have committed to 24 hours as a reasonable time frame to allow this process.

Why: This information must be collected in addition to item 36 to prevent a situation where the average interval is the same between an ILEC and a CLEC, but the ILEC nonetheless delays entry for some CLEC customers' for much longer periods of time than it delays information entry for its own customers. Delayed updates inconvenience customers and are not acceptable to them.

Item 38: Directory Listings Electronic Interface Availability

What: Measures the percentage of the time that an electronic interface allows the ILEC and the CLECs to input customer information directly into the directory listings database.

Why: Mandatory ILEC reporting will ensure that CLECs have an equal ability to transmit information about CLEC customers electronically to the directory listings database.

THE MINIMAL BURDEN TO THE ILECS OF REPORTING ON COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE DATA IS OUTWEIGHED BY THE COMPETITIVE BENEFITS

The burden on the ILEC of reporting on TCG's proposed performance measures should be minimal. The ILECs' automated systems should already create the objective data needed to compare performance measures,[11] particularly for provisioning and maintenance.[12] Even in those cases when an ILEC does not already record one of TCG's proposed performance measures, requiring the ILEC to begin recording and reporting such data is necessary in order to ensure that the ILEC satisfies the performance parity principle. The expansion of effective local exchange competition giving consumers choice as quickly as possible is well worth any additional ILEC effort required.

The ILEC is free to use manual or electronic means to satisfy its performance parity requirements. In all likelihood, however, as competitors' volume increases, the ILEC will be unable to accomplish parity without the cost-saving use of electronic interfaces between ILEC and CLEC Operations Support Systems (OSS). Should the ILEC continue to rely on manual means such as faxing, the ILEC must provide quality control and personnel management sufficient to achieve parity where ILEC measures exist, and sufficient to ensure parity in consumer service where such measures do not now exist. Should the ILEC choose to use electronic interfaces rather than manual means to satisfy its parity requirements, then facilities-based CLECs must be able to access the ILEC OSS as efficiently as the ILEC accesses them. TCG's upcoming white paper will deal with OSS electronic interfaces as a means of achieving performance parity.

---

[11] See Affidavit of Michael J. Friduss on Behalf of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Justice, In re Application of SBC Communications Inc. et al. Pursuant to Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in the State of Oklahoma, CC Docket No. 97-121 (May 16, 1997).

[12] For example, ILECs have automated data acquisition systems (DAS) that count minutes and report on them in various ways. One output of the DAS is Trunking Service Reports. The DAS includes Trunk Service Systems (TSS), Total Network Data Systems (TNDS) and Engineering and Data Acquisition System (EADAS).

CONCLUSION

It is the **outcome of performance parity** that is required by the Act. Performance parity measures must be adopted immediately, even while recognizing that over time the measures may be expanded, reduced or changed with changing needs. To the extent feasible, measures should be comparable (if not identical) for all ILECs. This will reduce ILEC opportunities to "game" the regulatory process and facilitate state regulatory enforcement of interconnection agreements between ILECs and CLECs. TCG hopes these Model Performance Parity Measures for facilities-based competition will begin the process of creating a nationally uniform set of performance parity measures.

*****

For further information, contact Gail Garfield Schwartz at 718-355-2892

or e-mail to schwartz@ tcg.com,

Other TCG Issue Papers:

- The Performance Parity Principle (July 1997)
- Clearing the Road: *The 1996 Telecommunications Act and Carrier Access to the Public Rights-of-Way* (July 1997)
- Universal Service Assurance: *Act Three of a Four Act Play* (April 1997)
- Beyond Cost Models: *Managing Interconnection Pricing to Achieve Sustainable Competition* (February 1997)
- The Number Crunch: *A TCG Solution - Revisited* (January 1997)
- Arbitration Results: *The Runs, The Hits, and The Errors* (November 1996)
- Arbitration: *The End Game* (June 1996)
- The Number Crunch: *A TCG Solution* (May 1996)
- Performance Standards: *Key To Interconnection* (April 1996)
- Effect of Resale on Facilities-Based Competition in the Local Exchange Market (November 1995)
- Interconnection Compensation - The Critical Issue for Local Exchange Competition (October 1995)
- States at the Forefront in Making Local Telecommunications Competition Legal (August 1995)
- The Economics of Interconnection (By Gerald Brock) (April 1995)
- Universal Service Assurance II: *A Blueprint for Action* (November 1994)
- CompLECS & Universal Service Assurance: *How Competition Will Strengthen Universal Telephone Service* (August 1994)
- Whither the CAPs? (June 1994)
- The Unlevel Playing Field: *Asymmetric Market Power Demands Asymmetric Regulation* (March 1994)
- Universal Service Assurance: *A Concept for Fair Contribution and Equal Access to the Subsidies* (December 1993)
- The "Pot Bay": *Phase II, Ameritech Takes a Step in the Right Direction* (November 1993)
- Telco Fiber Fiascos: *Will Accelerated Infrastructure Programs Be the Next Nuclear Power Plant Debacles?* (July 1993)
- The "Pot Bay": *Several BOCs Attempt to Obstruct Interconnection...Again* (June 1993)

For free copies of any of the above issue papers, please visit TCG's website at www.tcg.com or call (718) 355-2295.